

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Figures 20A and 20B. This sheet, which includes Figure 20A and 20B, replaces the original sheet including Figures 20A and 20B.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed January 6, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 31, 2006.

Claims 1-21 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Features based on claim 19 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 3; features based on claim 20 have been incorporated into independent claim 5; claim 21 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and new claims 22-28 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-18 and 22-28 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 22 are independent. Claims 7-18 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 22-28 are currently elected, of which claims 1, 3, 5 and 22 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action objects to Figures 20A and 20B as lacking a designation such as "Prior Art." As required by the Official Action, the Applicant has amended Figures 20A and 20B to include the designation "Prior Art," as shown in the attached replacement sheet. Reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action objects to claims 19 and 20 for informalities. Specifically, the Official Action suggests that "a potential" be changed to "the third potential" in claim 19 and to "the third potential" or "the fourth potential," as appropriate in claim 20. As noted above, features based on claim 19 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 3; and features based on claim 20 have been incorporated

into independent claim 5. In amended claims 1, 3 and 5, the Applicant has incorporated the Examiner's suggestions. Reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-6 and 19-21 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,198,699 to Hashimoto. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the Official Action has not established an anticipation rejection.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application. Specifically, claim 1 and 3 have been amended to recite features based on claim 19, i.e. wherein the circuit includes multiple resistors connected in series, wherein an end of one of the multiple resistors is connected to the first power source, wherein an end of another one of the multiple resistors is connected to the second power source, and wherein the third potential is outputted from a connecting node of two resistors that are selected from the multiple resistors. Claim 5 has been amended to recite features based on claim 20, i.e. wherein the first and second circuits each include multiple resistors connected in series, wherein an end of one of the multiple resistors of the first circuit is connected to the first power source, wherein an end of one of the multiple resistors of the second circuit is connected to the first power source, wherein an end of another one of the multiple resistors of the first circuit is connected to the second power source, wherein an end of another one of the multiple resistors of the second circuit is connected to the second power source, wherein the third potential is outputted from a connecting node of two resistors that are selected from the multiple resistors of the first circuit, and wherein the fourth potential is outputted from a connecting node of two resistors that are selected from the multiple resistors of the second circuit. For the reasons provided below, the

Applicant respectfully submits that Hashimoto does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

The Official Action asserts that "it is old and well known in the art that a transistor, when turning on, forms a resistor, and during the operation of the circuitry in Figure 4 of Hashimoto et al., the transistors 114 and 116 in the voltage divider circuit (114, 116), and the transistors 130 and [134] in the voltage divider (130, 134) are ON, so each of the transistors 114, 116, 130 and 134 forms a resistor" (page 4, Paper No. 20090104). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the assertions in the Official Action.

The voltage divider of the present application is formed of a resistor with a fixed resistance. Claims 1, 3 and 5 recite multiple resistors connected in series. That is, each of the resistors have a fixed resistance. It is well known that a transistor has two states, i.e. an On state and an Off state, and switching between these states is controlled by a voltage applied to a gate electrode. If a transistor is regarded as a resistor, then the transistor has variable resistance. On the other hand, it is known that a resistor does not change in its resistance, regardless of the applied voltage. In other words, a resistance of a resistor is constant. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that a transistor is different from a resistor, and that it is not reasonable to assert that the transistors of Hashimoto correspond to the resistors of the present claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Hashimoto does not teach the above-referenced features of claims 1, 3 and 5, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Hashimoto does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

New claims 22-28 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. The features of claims 22-24 are supported in the present specification, for example, by Figure 3 and paragraphs [0082] to [0085] (referring to the

pre-grant publication of the present application, i.e. U.S. Publication No. 2008/0252363).
The Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 22-28 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789